BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

Chair of the Assembly of the Academic Senate Faculty Representative to the Regents University of California 1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor Oakland, California 94607-5200

July 23, 2020

JANET NAPOLITANO, PRESIDENT UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Re: Report of the Regents' Working Group on Chancellor Search and Selection

Dear Janet,

Kum-Kum Bhavnani

Telephone: (510) 987-9303

Email:kum-kum.bhavnani@ucop.edu

Council has a number of serious concerns about the Report of the Regents' Working Group on Chancellor Search and Selection.

First, it is unclear what problem the recommendations are intended to fix. The chancellor search process is well-articulated and has resulted in a number of stellar recent recruitments, including white women, and men from historically minoritized groups. In fact, cutting back on the role of faculty in searches could lead to a degradation in the appointments of chancellors.

The proposed changes will diminish the role of the faculty and president in chancellor searches: doing so is neither justified nor appropriate. The process of keeping a significant faculty focus on the recruitment of their champion and leader is essential in the context of academics, education, and shared governance. As a number of Regents have commented, a chancellor cannot be expected to lead a campus successfully without the full confidence of the faculty on that campus. Overall, the recommendations posit a downgrading of the notion that UC is first and foremost an academic organization – the very thing that makes UC a research university.

The recommendation that the search firm conduct the preliminary screening of all prospects does not seem wise to Council. To do so would significantly reduce the involvement of faculty, who are the very people chancellors will lead, and who are ideally placed to assess the nominations by stakeholders during a chancellor search. It will also place an initial screening into the hands of people whose work is not central to that a of a Research I university, and whose imperatives could be very different, and not as robust, as those of those of faculty at a UC campus.

We are also concerned about the methods used to gather data for the report's conclusions. Only a small number of individuals were interviewed for the report, with minimal representation from faculty. The lack of inclusion of faculty has likely skewed the report's conclusions. For these reasons, amongst others, it is difficult to have confidence in the report's conclusions.

We offer our concerns to ensure that campuses are central in continuing the exceptional quality of the University. Simultaneously, Council urges the Regents to delay action on the report until Dr. Drake has assumed his position as President of the University of California. Taking Dr. Drake's views explicitly into account would ensure a successful start to his presidency.

Council requests that you send this letter to all members of the Board of Regents.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,

Kun Kun Bhawani .

Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Chair Academic Council

cc: Secretary of the Regents Shaw Chief of Staff Kao Chief Policy Advisor McAuliffe Academic Council Senate Directors